

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL AND AFRICAN STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Seminar on Aspects of Religion in South Asia

ENCOUNTERS WITH JOGĪS IN INDIAN SŪFĪ HAGIOGRAPHY

by Simon Digby

The anecdotes examined in this paper relate to Sūfī Shaykhs of the earlier period of Muslim dominance in India, extending from the beginning of the thirteenth to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, before Mughal rule brought a change in the Muslim religious climate of feeling. In two cases, where an example of a particular pattern of anecdote was lacking in near-contemporary sources, seventeenth century biographies of figures of the earlier period have been drawn upon.

Indian sūfī hagiographical literature falls into two main categories, the tadhkira which is a collection of anecdotes of a biographical character, generally but not invariably compiled posthumously, regarding a Shaykh or a number of Shaykhs; and the malfūz, which records, from notes made at the time, the day to day conversations and discourses of a Shaykh. The authentic examples of the latter class of composition are unique in the hagiographical literature of medieval India, in that they are immediately contemporary records of the spoken words and minutiae of behaviour of a class of religious leaders.

Notwithstanding its prevalent credulous and miraculous atmosphere Sūfī hagiographical literature is much the most realistic and historical tradition of such literature in medieval India; but the recorders, like the Shaykhs about whom they wrote, were pious and sectarian. If, where pious zeal has not obviously led to pious fiction, their good faith can be assumed, we must still be very careful in interpreting the accounts of authors whose conceptions of reality differed greatly from our own. It is sometimes more profitable to ask, not whether the events in an anecdote or something not unlike them actually took place, but rather, what impression did the author wish to convey in recording or transmitting the anecdote; and what analogues of it can be found elsewhere in the same literature?

In the considerable corpus of Ṣūfī and related Indo-Muslim literature, the attention devoted to Muslim relations with the non-Muslim majority of the population of India is disappointingly little. Even conversions to Islam are seldom recorded; and when they are recorded it is not usually on account of interest in the conversion per se. However in modern times very large claims have been made concerning the role of Ṣūfī Shaykhs in popularizing and acclimatizing Islam in the Indian environment, attending to the spiritual needs of the downtrodden masses, entering into profitable converse with religious leaders of other denominations and promoting communal unity. Accordingly a particular interest attaches to the scanty references in Ṣūfī hagiographical literature to contacts and converse of Ṣūfī Shaykhs with non-Muslim men of religion; and also to expressions of their attitudes towards alien faiths.

In Indo-Persian texts the word Jogī is borrowed from the North Indian vernaculars (Skt. Yogin). It seldom or never applies to a practitioner of Yoga in the wider, more ancient and more Brahmanical tradition of Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra. The Jogī is usually a follower of the Nātha-panthī tradition or some related sect but not necessarily a Kānpaṭā or a follower of Gorakh Nāth. Occasionally the term is extended to include other varieties of non-Muslim holy men other than Brahmans, such as followers of the Bhaktī cults. It is sometimes doubtful whether a Ṣūfī writer intends to distinguish between a Jogī and a Sannyāsī.

The practices of Indian ascetics, not specifically Jogīs, and their reputation for miraculous powers had been known in the Middle East before the establishment of the Dehli Sultanate. Shahrīstānī, writing in the early 12th century, described how the austerities of Indian ascetics produced mystical states, how they acquired the power to stop rain falling and how they could kill men by the force of imagination. Such a belief in the magical powers of Jogīs was indeed widely testified to by Muslims. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa described how he visited a Jogī on an island off the Malabar Coast, at whose cry a coconut fell from a tree in an apparently supernatural manner. Elsewhere Ibn Baṭṭūṭa describes the levitatory powers of the Jogīs which figure so frequently in these anecdotes.

of all classes of ascetics in India the Jogīs were most with whom the Ṣūfīs came most into contact. The disciplined ascetic practices of the Jogīs presented the greatest number of points of resemblance with their own; the Jogīs also advanced claims to miraculous powers over material phenomena similar to those attributed to the Ṣūfī Shaykhs. Accordingly in the Ṣūfī literature of the period we find reflexions on the general problem of the state of spiritual advancement which could be attained by non-Muslims. To what heights of mystical experience, of closeness to the Deity with its attendant benefits in miracle-working could a non-Muslim attain? The conclusion reached in answer to this difficult question is sometimes applied to a Hindu of unspecified sampradaya, in one or two instances to Brahmins, but most frequently to Jogīs.

In assessing these literary references to Jogīs, it should not be forgotten that Indian Islam was at this time permeated by Ṣūfī influence, to the extent that it is almost impossible to distinguish a non-Ṣūfī writer or a writer hostile to all Ṣūfī thought in the entire corpus of the surviving Persian literature of the Dehlī Sultanate. At the same time the writings of the Ṣūfī Shaykhs and their disciples were mainly very conciliatory towards orthodox Sunnī Muslim legal opinion, more so than recorded Ṣūfī practice. Conspicuous attention to the minutiae of orthodox Sunnī belief and of the Shar<sup>c</sup> was one, but only one, in the syndrome of qualities by which the pre-eminence in sanctity and power of a particular Ṣūfī Shaykh could be recognized. Other qualities in this syndrome of character - ascetic practices, miraculous powers over nature and evidence or rumours of immediate access to the deity could - unlike orthodox Muslim observance - also appear to be possessed by individual Jogīs or other non-Muslim holy men. The conclusions of arguments regarding the spiritual state of the Jogīs and other non-Muslim holy men differed according to the doctrinal temperament of the reasoners and according to the relative importance which they were inclined to attach to the different attributes in the syndrome of spiritual pre-eminence. Recorded opinions range from, on the one hand, the idea that the Jogīs were possessed of their powers and their doctrines as a result of Satanic inspiration, for the purpose of deceiving and perverting Muslim believers; to, on the other hand, the conviction that an individual Jogī whom the writer had met had attained to an ultimate state of spiritual experience.

In some cases the traces are visible of an uncertain oscillation of individual opinion.

We may first examine a statement which I would take as the median position of orthodox Indian Sūfī belief in this period. It does not deny to Jogīs, or to other unbelievers and heretics, the possibility of valid spiritual experience; it merely insists on the absolute inferiority of this to the claims of Sunnī Muslim religious orthodoxy. The interest of the statement is increased by the fact that it was made by Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsūdārāz, an original and powerful writer on religious topics of the later Dehlī Sultanate, whose anecdotes regarding Jogīs are more copious than those of any other Sūfī source.

"People keep on saying that Haqīqat (i.e. the mystical perception of God) is the Divine secret, but I, Muḥammad Husaynī say that Sharīcat (the observance of Muslim law) is the Divine secret: because I have also heard talk of Haqīqat from the mouths of Muvallahs, Haydarīs, Qalandars, Mulhids and Zindīqs; nay, I have even heard it from the mouths of Jogīs, of Brahmans and of Gurus: but talk of the Sharīcat I have not heard from the mouth of anyone other than the people of true faith and belief (i.e. Sunnī Muslims). Thus it is evident that the Sharīcat is the Divine secret."

The most hostile inspection of the claims of the Jogīs occurs in the Hujjat al-Hind, a polemical work probably composed in the Deccan around or shortly after 1400 A.D. The purpose of the author was to prevent rural Indian Muslims from back-sliding into Hindu beliefs and practices overwhelmingly prevalent in their villages. Earlier in the work Hindu deities had been identified with the fallen angels, companions of Iblīs or Satan, and the Brahmans had been denounced as the wickedest of all Hindus. When the author turned his attention to Jogīs, he denounced with especial fervour, in the course of a rambling and incoherent argument, the claim of the Jogīs that their faith was identical with Islām. The author Mihrābī mentions, evidently from personal observation, the manner in which the Jogīs identified the nāths of their pantheon with the Prophets who had preceded Muḥammad.

"Yet they have no proof which they can show or establish," Mihrābī writes, "except idle tales and verses (caupad) which the Jogīs have ascribed to them (the nāths). They also say, 'We talk of Gorakh and you of the Prophet Khidr; we talk of Cauranga and you of Ilyās: we of Mācchendar and you of the Prophet Yūnus.' This also is false: nay, it is unbelief (kufr)."

The identifications mentioned above are based on fortuitous resemblances between incidents in the nātha cycle of legends and the Qur'ānic tales of earlier prophets and require some elucidation. The legendary cycles attached to Gorakh Nāth and to Khiḍr are both so extensive that it is difficult to find the most likely point of correspondence in the mind of the Jogī advancing the proposition. Possibly it is power over water and drought. The correspondence between Caurāṅga or Caurangī Nāth and Ilyās (Elijah) is persecution by a King on the false accusation of his wicked Queen. Macchendar and Yūnus (Jonah) were both inside large fish.

The Hujjat al-Hind was not a specifically Ṣūfī work, and was written from quite different motives to those which inspired the ordinary Ṣūfī literature of the Dehlī Sultanate; but it has a considerable Ṣūfī content. Miḥrābī recognizes the parallel between Yogic practices and the Ṣūfī sulūk ("path"). The Jogīs are the sālīks ("travellers") of the heathen (ahl-i kufr). They (like the Ṣūfīs) perform riyādat (austerities) and mujāhida (spiritual exercise), but they are on a false path (bar bātil). They do not perform wadū' (Islamic ablutions): they lack the light of perception (nūr-i mu<sup>c</sup>āyina): they are deprived (mahrūm, sc. of Grace). Like the Brahmans, the Jogīs also are leaders among the heathen and they are more wicked than those whom they lead into error. Their place is among the munāfiqīn.

Miḥrābī's sharp denunciation of the Jogīs is not characteristic of the majority of references to them in the literature of the Dehlī Sultanate. The most famous of all the Shaykhs of the Dehlī Sultanate, Nizām al-dīn Awliyā' mentions his favourable impression of a Jogī with whom he had talked. On one occasion at Ajodhan a Jogī had come (to the Khānqāh). The Shaykh asked along what 'path' he went and what was the fundamental idea among his sect? The Jogī replied that in his circles it was thought that in the personality of man there were two worlds, a higher and a lower. The higher was from the crown of the head to the navel: the lower from the navel to the feet. The manner of operation (sabīl-i kār) was that in the higher world there functioned sincerity (ṣadq), purity (ṣafā), good conduct (akhlāq-i khūbī) and beauty (ḥusn, sc. of character): in the lower world, self control (nigāhdāsh), cleanliness (pākī) and abstinence (pārsā'ī). Nizām al-dīn, relating this, remarked that the words of the Jogī pleased him.

The Jogī appears to have given an allegorizing description of Yogic physiological concepts. The most prominent disciple of Nizām al-dīn, Naṣīr al-dīn Maḥmūd incidentally remarks in a discussion of techniques of breath-control (habs-i dam) that such control was also practised by perfected Jogīs such as are called in Hindī siddh.

Another important Sūfī Shaykh from a different silsila, Sharaf al-dīn Aḥmad b. Yahyā of Maner in Bihar expressed the point of view that the Jogīs had an originally valid tradition of mystical experience, but that this had been handed down in a progressively corrupt form. In a recorded conversation one Qādī Sharaf al-dīn asked the Shaykh about a saying that he had heard; "The Jogīs say that if you wish to live you should learn to die." (The reference is to the Yogic quest for physical immortality, and to techniques for the suspension of perceptible life and survival during periods of enterment.) Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn Aḥmad replied: "Yes indeed, the Jogīs say this, but they do not understand the meaning of this saying. In truth the founder of this faith (madhhab) must himself have stated this idea in its original sense, but it has been corrupted by ignorant re-tellers."

The most remarkable and liberal view of a Jogī expressed in the literature of the Dehli Sultanate is that of a fairly important Chishtī Shaykh of the 14th century capital city, Ṣadr al-dīn Ḥakīm, who was a disciple and khalīfa of Shaykh Naṣīr al-dīn Maḥmūd 'Chirāgh-i Dehlī'. Evidently as a result of discussions with an individual Jogī, Ṣadr al-dīn was led to the conclusion that this Jogī had reached an ultimate state of mystical experience. He found this idea difficult to accept, no doubt because of the fact that the Jogī did not profess Islam, but ultimately he was convinced of it as result of a mystical illumination of his own which, occurring as it did at a particular time and place, overcame his doubts.

The reference to this Jogī occurs in one of the ornate Sūfī letters (maktūbāt), which form this Shaykh's surviving prose work. The letter is addressed to a friend on the subject of the ultimate station (maqām) of mystical experience, that of al-fanā' min al-fanā' (annihilation proceeding from annihilation). This station Ṣadr al-dīn equates with the sūn (Skt. śūnya, the Void) to which the perfected Jogī attains. In the passage which follows sūn is several times used to express this ultimate state of reality. At the close of the letter - after remarks on the incomprehensibility of the mystery of the Unity of Existence (wahdat al-wujūd) - Ṣadr al-dīn remarks:

and I do not know whether that Jogī intends the same meaning from this word (i.e. sūn) or something else. If the same meaning, I am his slave! For a while the conversation of this Jogī who talks of sūn was very difficult for me; and I denied it and did not accept it, until one day I was engaged in the mid-morning devotions in the garden of the late Khvāja Sadr al-dīn, the grandson of Mawlānā Hamīd al-dīn Mukhlis. In the course of murāqiba (interior recollection) God - may He be exalted - of his Grace revealed it to me."

This expression of opinion is the more remarkable in view of a biographical anecdote which we possess regarding Sadr al-dīn. Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz, in one of his conversations, mentions the unduly insulting manner in which Sadr al-dīn addressed a Hindu physician, merely because the latter was not a Muslim, which drew the remonstrances of the narrator himself. This anecdote was mentioned en passant by S.A.A. Rizvi, and its significance when considered in relation to the respective viewpoints of Sadr al-dīn and Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz with regard to Wahdat al-wujūd, the first for and the second against it, was pointed out by the present writer in his review of Dr. Rizvi's work. Taken in conjunction with Sadr al-dīn's startling confession of faith in the mystical state of the Jogī, it affords yet another example of the lack of a monolithic and unvarying unity of attitude to towards non-Muslims which is frequently found in the thought of individual Muslims.

Three classes of anecdotes regarding Jogīs in the Sufī literature of the Dehlī Sultanate can be arranged in a series of progressive elaboracy viz:-

- (1) Plain anecdotes of the voluntary conversion of Jogīs, followed by their attainment of a high 'station' on the Sufī 'path'.
- (2) Anecdotes of magic contests, leading to the subjugation and conversion of the Jogī, again usually followed by his attainment of a high Sufī station.
- (3) Anecdotes of magic contest and conversion which have a regional significance, in that the Jogī is displaced as the locum tenens of a sacred or otherwise desirable site by the Sufī Shaykh. Professing Islam and attaining a Sufī 'station', the Jogī is accomodated in a subordinate capacity on the same holy site, or as an esteemed member of the Shaykh's entourage.

To these we may add two more classes of anecdotes:-

- (4) Anecdotes of the refusal of a proffered gift, by which the Shaykh demonstrates his superiority to the Jogī. These sometimes include and sometimes omit the motif of the

conversion of the Jogī and his subsequent attainments.

There are also obvious affinities with anecdotes of class (2).

(5) Anecdotes referring casually to the lore, magical or scientific, of the Jogīs.

Class (1). Anecdotes of conversion without a magical contest.

This class is represented in the Ṣūfī literature of the Dehlī Sultanate by a fine and rather realistic anecdote concerning Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn Ahmad b. Yahyā of Maner, whose views on the original possession by the Yogīs of a tradition of spiritual knowledge and on its progressive corruption have been quoted earlier. The anecdote occurs in the Manāqib al-asfiyyā' of Shaykh Shu<sup>c</sup>ayb, a tadhkira of Shaykhs of the Firdawsī Silsila probably compiled about thirty years after the death of Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn. Although the element of a magical contest is absent, a jockeying for spiritual prestige and the overwhelming of the Jogī by the superior charisma of the Shaykh are strongly emphasized.

The compiler remarks that it is related that there was a Jogī possessed of spiritual attainments who came to Bihar. There he met some of the disciples of Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn. It occurred to these disciples that God had bestowed evident spiritual attainments upon this non-Muslim. The Jogī, who possessed clairvoyant powers, recognized what they were thinking. "You should not harbour such thoughts in your hearts," he told them. "Have you any Guru?" The author here explains that the Jogīs call a Pīr a Guru in their language. Some of the disciples said that indeed they had a Guru, and proceeded to tell the Jogī about Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn and his virtues. The Jogī, divining what they had in mind, suggested that the Shaykh should come to him. The disciples then said that he was a holy man and did not visit anyone; on the contrary everyone visited him. "Take me to him," said the Jogī. They took him with them and brought him to Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn. As soon as the Jogī's eye fell upon the Shaykh, he leapt backwards, "Why are you running away?" they asked. "God (kartār) has taken on created form (rūp)," the Jogī replied. "I have not the strength to go up to him. If I do so I shall be burnt up."

The author here explains that kartār and rūp are in Muslim terms ḥaqq ("Truth", the unqualified Divine Nature) and sifāt (the 'attributes' of God which permeate the created universe). The terms kartāra and rūpa belong to Bhaktī theology - and recognizably to the saguna or incarnational



the suspicion that here and possibly elsewhere the term Jogī is used not specifically for a Nātha Yogī but more loosely in order to include other varieties of Indian sādhus.

The disciples afterwards told Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn what had happened to the Jogī. The Shaykh smiled and said, "Tell him that now he can come and look (at me): and that now he will have the strength to do so." When the Jogī came back, he gazed at the Shaykh and said, "Now I can come forward." He came forward, sat down in the Shaykh's gathering and remained seated there for a long time. He then asked to be instructed in Islam. Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn so instructed him and kept him at his side for three days. After this he gave him leave to depart. Someone asked the Shaykh why he had let him leave after only a short time in his company? "He had completed his task," the Shaykh replied. "The rust of unbelief was a veil for him. When he had professed Islam that rust was removed after (only) a short association; and I gave him leave to depart."

The morphology of this anecdote repays further examination. The concept of the necessity of the mediatory role of the Pīr was most firmly established among the theological ideas of Sufism in its high developed period - extending from about the twelfth Christian century to the present day. To arrive at a perfected state, at the Blessed Vision (ru'iyat) was only possible when a disciple had surrendered his will and his intellect to a Pīr who would guide him along the stages of the Path towards this end. Elaborate explanations had to be devised to justify the evident sanctity of some who were not known to have had a Pīr to guide them at all. Beyond this, seldom expressed in literature which would give the orthodox grounds of attack, but perpetually on the fringes of Sūfī convictions is an incarnational concept, in which the Pīr is revered by the disciple as an embodiment of the - Divine Nature. In the safe framework of the anecdote quoted above the Jogī says that Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn is the Creator (kartār) who has taken on created form (rūp). Such a statement might expose a man who was already a Muslim to extreme penalties; but the Jogī had not yet accepted Islam at the time he made it. The statement might therefore be quoted with approval by the followers of the Shaykh, including the author of the Tadhkira, without laying themselves open to charges of heresy.

In Sūfī practice a considerable number of disciples (murīds) gathered round a Shaykh (or Pīr) to devote themselves to the full-time pursuit of the holy life. With the Shaykh's and their

own families and dependents they formed the nucleus of a khānqāh establishment of considerable size. The murīds were of varying intellectual or spiritual capacity, and the Pīr alone was qualified to pronounce when they had reached a state of spiritual independence, in which they no longer had need of his supervision and might go forth to instruct others and make their own disciples. By this they would attain also financial and personal independence. Particularly in a Khānqāh of large size and under a Pīr of widespread reputation, the favour accorded to individual disciples and the speed with which they attained their licences to go forth into the world and set up as Pīrs themselves gave rise to acute ill-feeling. In consequence there exists a class of anecdotes in Indian Ṣūfī literature explaining in vivid similes the inequalities of human endowments, in a manner not unlike that of the Christian parable of the Talents. Bahā' al-dīn Zakariyā, according to Niẓām al-dīn's account, came to the Khānqāh of Shaykh Shihāb al-dīn 'Umar Suhrawardī in Baghdād and after only seventeen days received from the Shaykh his Khilāfat Nāma - a document of investiture as a successor in the Silsila - and leave to depart. When disciples who had served the Shaykh for years came and remonstrated with him, they received the reply that Bahā' al-dīn was firewood ready for kindling while they were but green and damp branches. Bahā' al-dīn had attained a promising spiritual state before he came to the Khānqāh, and only needed the mediation of a Pīr of sufficient competence to achieve a perfected state. In the anecdote of the Jogī from the Manāqib al-asfiyā' the same complaints are voiced, evidently with more polite moderation, by the disciples who are the regular inmates of the Khānqāh; and an answer which is very similar in substance is vouchsafed by the Shaykh. But the explanation of the previous obstacle to the attainment of a perfected state includes not only the lack of a mediating Pīr but also the lack of a belief in, or knowledge of Islam, which is compared to the 'rust'-obscuring vision upon a steel mirror. This is a common Ṣūfī simile: the mirror is that of the human faculties, which, cleansed of the obscurities of neglect, by receiving and retaining the image of the Divine, reflect and therefore resemble it.

Class (2). Anecdotes of conversion after a magical contest, without regional significance.

Mihrābī in the course of his denunciations of the Jogīs credits them with supernatural powers:-

"If a Jogī should raise the dead to life - and we take refuge with God from this! - this should not be taken at its apparent value: and if he manifests a miracle (karāmatē) of the type of a break in the natural order (kharq-i 'adat), you should know that it is wholly of Satanic inspiration and there is nothing of Divine Grace in it: until such time as he may be ennobled by (embracing) Islām."

This line of thought, which admits the possibility of unbelievers possessing and demonstrating supernatural powers, is of the oldest origins in Islām. In the Qur'ān itself, the Prophet had denounced istidrāj, the demonstration of such powers by unbelievers with the intention of perverting his followers. Though Mihrābī in the passage above uses karāmat, in the Sūfī contest anecdotes of the Dehlī Sultanate istidrāj is the term almost invariably used for the display of powers by the Jogīs, as apposed to karāmat ('a special Grace') for the miracles of the Sūfī Shaykhs.

In the period of the Muslim presence in India, such contest anecdotes are not found only in Muslim sources, although the Sūfīs appear to possess a more copious, detailed and specific hagiographical tradition than does any class of non-Muslim devotees. The winner of the contest is naturally of the same sect as the narrator.

Anecdotes in this class and the class which follows depend upon a conviction in a Muslim audience of the miraculous, magical or hallucinatory powers of the Jogīs, especially of the 'Indian rope-trick' variety. The commonest anecdotes concern the levitation of human beings or of objects, the latter of homely character but symbolic significance, from staffs to slippers, which of course belong to the Sūfī victors.

A characteristic fourteenth century example of the contest anecdote appears in that most celebrated book of malfūzāt, the Favā'id al-fu'ād, which records the conversations of Shaykh Nizām al-dīn 'Awliyā' of Dehli. In Nizām al-dīn's narrative the Jogī is shown visiting a Shaykh. There is no indication of a struggle for dominance of a geographical area and no mention of a Khānqāh being set up as a consequence of the Jogī's conversion.

A conversation which occurred on the 5th Šafar, 710/4th July 1310 turned upon the topic of levitation. Nizām al-dīn had related the case of a preacher at the mosque of Badā'ūn, who had reached such an ecstasy in his address to the congregation of the mosque that he took flight from the mimbar to the top of a nearby wall. He then recalled how a Jogī came to the town of Uech to dispute with Shaykh Šafī al-dīn Gāzarūnī. The Jogī challenged the Shaykh to show any powers which he could not equal. To this the Shaykh replied that it was the Jogī who was advancing a claim and he should show his accomplishment first. The Jogī rose from the ground into the air until his head reached the ceiling, and then came down to the ground in the same fixed position and invited the Shaykh to show his power. The Shaykh turned his gaze towards heaven and said, "O Lord, You have given this power to (one who is) a stranger (to You)! Bestow on me also this grace!" The Shaykh then rose from his place and flew away towards the Qibla; from there he flew to the North and then towards the South, and finally came back to his own place and sat down. The Jogī was astonished and, laying his head at the Shaykh's feet, said: - "I can do no more than rise straight upwards from the ground and come down in the same way. I cannot go to the right and to the left. You flew whichever way you desired. This is true and (from) God: my own (powers) are false."

Anecdotes of this class are less common than those in the following class (3). This is because of the comparative lack of purpose in such contests when they do not establish dominion over a geographical area or a shrine, but merely occupy a minor place in the manāqib or record of the virtues and powers of an individual Shaykh.

Class (3). Anecdotes of magical contests, followed by conversion with a territorial significance.

When the contest between a Šufī and a Jogī resulted in the establishment of the dominion of the former over a territory or a shrine, a significance which would otherwise have been lacking was given to the anecdote.

In medieval India the struggle of religious allegiances was bitter and the fortunes of war were commemorated in myth and legend. The takeover of a sacred site which enjoyed the material support of the population of the surrounding area by the devotees of a new or resurgent cult from the priests of an earlier and waning cult is a well attested process common before the arrival of Islam as well as after.

From the number of examples of which we have no record, there can be no doubt that Ṣūfī Shaykhs setting up Khānqāhs in rural surroundings in South Asia favoured already existing sacred sites, Hindu or Buddhist or of local godlings. This follows the tradition not only of the indigenous faiths of India, but also of Islam in the Near East - which repeated the pattern of the takeover of the Hajar al-aswad at Makka in many small and remote sacred places. In the Ṣūfī literature of the Dehlī Sultanate no clearly argued reason for the choice of such earlier sacred sites is expressed; it is usually stated that they have pleasant air and are suitably situated. More extended reflexions on the romantic appeal of such sites and the practical benefits of using them are put into the mouth of the ghāzī Sālār Masʿūd by Ilān-diyā Chishtī, who also wrote the Siyar al-aqtāb from which anecdotes have been cited regarding more typical Ṣūfī leaders. There are traces of an earlier sacred association in many of the great Ṣūfī shrines of South Asia (e.g. Ajmer, Pākpaṭṭan, Saiyid <sup>ʿ</sup>Alī Hamadānī's Khānqāh at Urinagar). Where such traces are absent, the foundation of the Khānqāh may often be related to its proximity to a capital city (e.g. Niẓām al-dīn's Khānqāh at Dehlī, Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz' at Gulbarga, the Niʿmat allāhī Khānqāh at Bidar).

"There is scarcely a village," Sir Aurel Stein wrote about Kashmir, "which has not its sacred spring or grove for the Hindu and its Ziarat (e.g. a Sufi tomb generally with servitors) for the Muhammadan. Established as the latter shrines almost invariably are, by the side of Hindu places of worship and often with the very stones taken from them, they plainly attest the abiding nature of local worship in Kashmir." Sir Thomas Arnold makes a very similar observation:- "In many instances there is no doubt that the shrine of a Muslim saint marks the site of some local cult which was practised on the spot long before the introduction of Islām." In the establishment of a Ṣūfī centre, the destruction of the shrine of the earlier faith and the expulsion or conversion of the priests commonly took place. Stein elsewhere noted the number of Saivite relics about the Ṣūfī shrines of Turkestan; and immediate external models for Ṣūfī behaviour in India can be found in Iran in the preceding centuries, where the Ṣūfī orders established Khānqāhs on the site of Zoroastrian fire-temples. Jamālī, who travelled in the late fifteenth century in what is now western Afghanistan, mentions the takeover by the Chishtī Shaykh <sup>ʿ</sup>Uthmān Harvanī - almost inevitably

after a display of miraculous powers - of a local fire-temple. After a residence on the site of two years and a half, he left the former leaders among the fire-priests in charge in their new guise of Ṣūfī Pīrs. This pattern of accomodation must have taken place at other shrines outside the Indian sub-continent. At Chisht in western Afghanistan, where the most influential silsila of the earlier period of Indo-Muslim history originated, there is a strong suspicion of the founding of the silsila from a marital alliance between the original Muslim and Ṣūfī evangelist of the area and some indigenous holders of power, from which the Ṣūfī inheritance passed to the son of the evangelist's wife's brother.

When they settled in India in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, there was ample precedent for Ṣūfī Shaykhs to attempt to seize shrines and to reach some degree of accomodation with those whom they were ousting from control. Destruction of Hindu temples by Ṣūfī Shaykhs who set up no permanent Khānqāh upon the site is also recorded. Instances are also recorded, though none from the Dehli Sultanate, of the conversion of existing incumbents who thereby managed to retain exclusive control of their shrines: e.g. in fifteenth century Kashmir Bābā Bām al-dīn (sic), a Pūjārī of a Hindu Tīrtha in the Pahalgām valley is said to have professed Islām at the hands of another Ṣūfī and retained control of his sacred site.

Another variant pattern recorded in Kashmir is the purchase of a Hindu temple site by a Ṣūfī wishing to establish his own Khānqāh. However in general holy places of worship and with a source of income in offerings are not for sale; and the dispossession of their incumbents or their reduction in status had to be accomplished more or less against their will. Anecdotes of class (3) reflect this situation.

Compared with the previous class, these anecdotes tend to greater elaboracy. Perhaps the most fanciful of all is found in the 17th century tadhkira Siyar al-aqtāb. This concerns the establishment of the greatest Ṣūfī pilgrimage centre in South Asia by Shaykh Mu<sup>c</sup>īn al-dīn Chishtī at Ajmer. Mu<sup>c</sup>īn al-dīn triumphs over three separate adversaries, a local deity or dev, the Jogī Ajaypāl and the Chauhan ruler Rāī Piṭhorā. The local deity submitted first, in whose shrine the Shaykh was afterwards to take up residence. The Jogī Ajaypāl next came to drive away the Shaykh, flying upon his deerskin. Seven times he was struck blind upon the way, each time when he harboured an evil thought against the

and the converted dev were guarded within a magical circle. Mu<sup>c</sup>īn al-dīn sent the dev to fill a cup at the local lake and drained it of water. The Jogī despatched against the Shaykh a multitude of snakes, but these were transformed into shady trees. Then Ajaypāl flew up to the sky upon his deerskin, but was beaten down to earth again by the Shaykh's slipper whacking him on the head. After this Ajaypāl gave up and was converted. He was then taken by the Shaykh on a trip to Heaven and, at his own request, he was given life on earth until the Day of Judgement. "People say that he still lives in these hills at Ajmer, and some men have met him: but his appearance is such that no man recognizes him. Once he met a woodcutter and he fed the woodcutter on rice-milk..." Ajaypāl, later thought to be a Jogī, is the eponymous Cauhan founder of the city of Ajmer and his cult is celebrated locally with an annual festival in the Hindu year. There is no trace of this anecdote of Mu<sup>c</sup>īn al-dīn's confrontation with a Jogī in earlier biographical accounts of the Shaykh.

Of anecdotes from sources nearly contemporary with the Dehlī Sultanate, that of the confrontation of Shaykh Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī with the Jogī afterwards called Kamāl is one of the most elaborate, recalling in a number of features that of Mu<sup>c</sup>īn al-dīn's coming to Ajmer as found in the Siyar al-aqtāb. It is of additional interest in that there is a more detailed description than we have elsewhere of the selection and settlement of a Khānqāh site. The levitatory competition is extended, and the Shaykh is depicted as only indirectly competing against the Jogī, the operations being undertaken by a newly converted disciple acting under the orders of the Shaykh. The implication is that direct participation in such a contest might demean the Shaykh by placing him on a plane of possible equality with the Jogī.

According to the narrator, before Ashraf Jahāngīr took his final leave of his Pīr, Shaykh 'Alā' al-dīn 'Ganj-i nabāt' Chishtī of Pāndwa in Bengal, the latter showed him in a vision where his tomb would lie. (The Siyar al-aqtāb has a similar account of the Prophet at Madīna showing Mu<sup>c</sup>īn al-dīn the city of Ajmer amid its hills). What Ashraf Jahāngīr saw was a circular lake with a small hill beside it: he was told that he would be buried upon the hill. He then left Pāndwa and came to Jaunpūr, where he set about looking for the place in question. With his followers he set out towards Avadh: but he did not find the place he was

looking for another place to build. The local landholder there; this man waited upon him and showed him much kindness, accompanying him in his search for the place which he had seen in the vision. There then came into view a circular tank, upon seeing which the Shaykh said that this was the place which his Fīr had revealed to him. Malik Mahmūd suggested that although the situation was agreeable, with water on all four sides of the piece of land, there was a difficulty in that a Jogī resided there, and he could only settle there if he had the power to confront him. The Shaykh said, "The Truth came and falsehood perished: lo, falsehood perishes!" What is difficult about driving out a body of unbelievers?" He then ordered a servant to tell the Jogī to depart from there.

The Jogī sent back the reply that he had five hundred disciples with him. If any man could oust him by spiritual power, very well: but to make him leave would be no easy thing.

Now there was one man who had that very day become a disciple of the Shaykh; he was called Jamāl al-dīn Rāvat. The Shaykh told him to go forth and give an answer to the Jogī's display of powers. When Jamāl al-dīn hesitated to do so, the Shaykh called him up close to him and took some pān out of his own mouth and placed it with his own hand in Jamāl al-dīn's mouth. As Jamāl al-dīn ate the pān he was overcome by a strange exaltation and he bravely set out for the battle. He went to the Jogī and said, "We do not think it becoming to display miracles (karāmāt), but we will give an answer to each of the powers (istidrāj) which you display. The first trick that the Jogī showed was that from every direction heaps of black ants advanced towards Jamāl al-dīn: but when Jamāl al-dīn looked resolutely at them they vanished. After this an army of tigers appeared, but Jamāl al-dīn merely said, "What harm can a tiger do me?" And they all fled. After various tricks the Jogī threw his stick into the air. Jamāl then asked for the staff of the Shaykh and sent it up after it. The Shaykh's staff beat down the Jogī's stick until it brought it down to the ground. When the Jogī had exhausted all his tricks he then said, "Take me to the Shaykh! I will become a believer." Jamāl al-dīn grasped his hand and took him and made him prostrate himself at the feet of the Shaykh, and the Shaykh instructed him in the words of the profession of faith in Islam. At the same time all the disciples of the Jogī became Muslims and made a bonfire of their religious books. The Shaykh bestowed a place upon them on the banks of the lake and occupied them with austerities and spiritual exercises according to his own path. After this he commanded



to all his followers so that each could build a separate cell (hujra). Malik Mahmūd built a Khānqāh there in the space of a few days for the Shaykh and he made his own children and servants profess themselves the disciples of the Shaykh. The Saiyids of the neighbourhood also came to visit and entered the circle of allegiance and within three years the bare ground was transformed into a rosebed. The Shaykh gave to the area the name of Rūhābād (abode of the Spirit) and gave the Khānqāh the name of Kathratābād (abode of multiplicity). He prophesied that the place would be a great light in future ages and that great men of their day, rijāl al-ghayb and many saints of God would come there and gain merit. The tomb of the Shaykh is in the middle of the lake.

An unusual feature of the Latā'if-i ashrafī is that it not only describes the conversion of the Jogī, but in two further anecdotes provides a follow-up to the case history. The first of these anecdotes demonstrates that not only the Jogī but also his cat attained a considerable degree of Muslim sanctity and were possessed of extraordinary powers.

It had occurred to a disciple of Shaykh Ashraf Jahāngīr, Qāḍī Rafī<sup>c</sup> al-dīn by name and an inhabitant of Avadh, that in former times there were Shaykhs whose glance had power over animals and birds: but he did not know whether such people existed at the present day. The Shaykh when he learnt of this, smiled and said, "Perhaps!" Now Kamāl the Jogī had a cat which sometimes used to pass in front of the Shaykh. He ordered the cat to be brought to him and began a discourse on a holy topic. The Shaykh's face gradually assumed such an expression that all present were struck with fear. The cat also listened to the discourse and was so affected that it fell down unconscious: when it came to its senses again, it began to rub the feet of the Shaykh and then those of the other companions. After this it became a habit that when the Shaykh was talking upon divine mysteries, the cat never left the holy gathering. When travellers were about to come to the Khānqāh, it used to indicate their numbers by mewing; from this the servitors of the Khānqāh would know for how many guests to lay the cloth for a meal. At the time when the food was served, the cat also was given a portion equal to that of others who were present, and sometimes it was sent to bring members of the company who had been summoned. It would go to the room of the person who had been called and by mewing insistently or banging at the door would make the person understand that the Shaykh had summoned him.

One day a party of Darveshes had arrived at the Khānqāh. The cat mewed as usual but when the food was sent it appeared that it was short by one portion. The Shaykh turned to the cat and said, "Why have you made a mistake today?" The cat immediately went away and began to sniff at each of the Darveshes of the party. When it came to the head of the band it jumped upon his knee and made a mess. When the Shaykh saw what had happened he said, "The poor cat has done nothing wrong: this man is a stranger!" The head of the band immediately cast himself at the feet of the Shaykh and said: "I am a Dahriyya (materialist). For twelve years I have travelled through the world wearing the garments of Islam. It was my intention that if it should so befall that some Ṣūfī recognized me, I would accept Islam. Up to now none has known my secret: but that cat has revealed it. Today I accept Islam." The Shaykh taught him the professions of faith, made him his disciple and gave him mortifications and spiritual exercises to perform. Some time afterwards, when it appeared that his interior personality had been cleansed, the Shaykh honoured him with his ijāzat and khilāfat and entrusted to him <sup>the</sup> spiritual guidance of Istambūl.

The cat remained alive until after the death of the Shaykh. One day the sajjāda-nashīn of the Shaykh had put a pot of milk upon the fire in order to cook shīr-birinj (rice-pudding) and it chanced that a snake fell into the pot. The cat saw this and circled around the pot: he would not budge from the place and he mewed several times, but the cook did not understand and drove him out of the kitchen. When the cat saw that there was no way of making the cook understand, he leapt into the boiling liquid and surrendered his life. The rice had of course to be thrown away, and with it a black snake was discovered. The Sajjāda nashīn remarked that the cat had sacrificed his own life for the sake of Darveshes, and a tomb should be built for him. So the cat was buried near the tomb of Shaykh Ashraf Jahāngīr and a structure was erected over his grave.

In describing the beatific end of the cat we are however anticipating what had happened to Kamāl Jogī. It appears from another anecdote that Shaykh Ashraf Jahāngīr, who shared with Shaykh Jalāl al-dīn 'Makhdūm-i Jahānīān' the distinction of being the most peripatetic of Ṣūfīs of the Delhi Sultanate, had taken Kamāl Jogī on one of his lengthy and extensive tours of the Near East at some time after his main Khānqāh at Kacchocch had been established. The Shaykh's party arrived at Shirvān, at the North Eastern Caspian extremity of Persia, now well within the

Russian borders, during a period of intense cold.

Nizām Yamanī, the compiler of the Tadhkira says that the story was related to him by a dependant of the Shaykh, called Abu'l-Vafā' Khvārazmī, who had accompanied him on this journey. The Shaykh was passing through Shirvān and encamped in a mosque for the night. There was much snow. Kamāl Jogī went out during the night to relieve himself, and departed to a corner. There as an effect of the snow his body lost the power of motion and his life was endangered. At that time the Shaykh was performing his ablutions. He immediately felt such an intense cold that his whole body was frozen. His followers were surprised, because there was a fire in the room and it was closed to the outside and he was wearing warm clothes. What was the cause of this icy feeling ? One sage conjectured that the Shaykh might be afflicted with the pain being suffered by someone else: they must find out of what 'friend' it was. Those who had accompanied him were counted and it was found that Kamāl Jogī was not there. When people went out to look for him they found that he had collapsed in the snow. A fire was lit and warm clothes were put over him, and in proportion as the effect of the snow left the Jogī's body the Shaykh also obtained relief from his pain.

This is the last information which we have of Kamāl Jogī and it is not known whether he predeceased his Shaykh or his cat. Anecdotes of the sympathetic transference of pain similar to that just given are not uncommon in Sufi literature. A similar story is also told in late sources regarding the two fourteenth century Dehli poets Amīr Ḥasan and Amir Khusraw.

from the two classes of anecdotes of magical contest examined above, but not in their intent, which is simply to demonstrate the superiority of the Ṣūfī Shaykh to the Jogī. Some but not all include the conversion of the Jogī at the end of the story. They approach the anecdotes of magical contest in that what is generally offered is an object of extraordinary properties or some kind of secret learning, while some anecdotes include a display of magical powers by the Ṣūfī Shaykh in order to demonstrate the superfluity of the proffered gift.

The most notable anecdote of the refusal of a gift proffered by a Jogī is told in the first person by Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz. It is long, detailed and circumstantial and presents complex problems of interpretation. A simpler model of interpretation. A simpler model of this class of anecdotes is therefore desirable. No example is provided in the contemporary Ṣūfī literature of the Dehli Sultanate and it is again necessary to draw upon the seventeenth century Siyar al-aqtāb, for an anecdote concerning a fourteenth century Chishtī Shaykh resident close to the capital city at Pānīpat - Shaykh Jalāl al-dīn 'Kabīr al-awliyā'! Our confidence in the narration of the Siyar al-aqtāb is not increased by its statement that this Shaykh lived 170 years. Nevertheless there is no doubt that the anecdote given below concerns a figure of the Dehli Sultanate, even though the antiquity of its transmission is suspect as well as its plausibility.

The Siyar al-aqtāb relates that once Shaykh Jalāl al-dīn Muḥammad 'Kabīr al-awliyā' came to a mountain peak where he saw a Jogī with his eyes closed in the state which 'the people of India' call dhyan. The Shaykh stood for a long time in front of him until the Jogī opened his eyes and a thought occurred to him. The Jogī brought out a stone from his robe, gave it to the Shaykh and said, "Do you know that this is what they call the Philosophers' Stone (pāras)? Any piece of iron on which you rub it becomes gold."

The Shaykh took the stone and threw it into a stream which ran beside them. The Jogī was amazed when he saw this: and he rose and clutched the Shaykh, and began to speak harshly. "Sir," he said, "I discovered this stone after a thousand exertions and labours. Alas that you did not know its value ! I had pity on your condition and gave it to you, so that you might be delivered from poverty and need. Now it would be the best course for you to give me back that stone by any means possible to you. If it was of no use, why did you not

to me it became my property and I did with it as I thought fit."

"What you have said is true," the Jogī answered, "and if you had gone out of my sight it would have been permissible for you to have done what you pleased. But what makes me sorry is that you threw it away in my presence. I am not going to take my hands off you until you give me back the stone!"

The Shaykh realized that he would not be satisfied until he got what he wanted. "You short-sighted man!" he said. "Go to this stream and pick up your stone: but only with the condition that if you see many more of the same kind there you do not covet them."

The Jogī agreed to this and went into the stream as he had been told to do. He saw that thousands upon thousands of Philosophers' Stones were lying there, and on top of them was his own stone, which he picked up. But greed would not let him be content with this and willy-nilly he picked up another, intending to conceal it and break his promise. But he then repented, and he came quickly back and after laying both of the stones which he had picked up at the feet of the Shaykh, placed his head there also. "Sir," he said, "bestow upon me a portion of the learning and (spiritual) knowledge which places you beyond these desires. Have heed for me!" The Shaykh perceiving by innerlight that the moment of the Jogī's good-fortune had come, urged Islām upon him until he recited with sincerity of heart the profession of God's Unity, and thus became a Musalmān. The Jogī then attained the rank of discipleship and served the Shaykh until after spiritual exercise he became a perfect Walī.

Like many other anecdotes of the Siyar al-aqtāb this anecdote can hardly be true and is not ben trovato. It is difficult to see why any but the most stupid of men, if he possessed one Philosophers' Stone should covet another: or if he set any store by its possession, should open his eyes from trance and bestow it upon a stranger.

The Manāḡib al-aṣfiyyā has an anecdote regarding the supposed powers of Jogīs to transmute to gold, which shows a much more sophisticated imagination, providing a neat inversion of the 'contest' and 'proffered gift' classes of anecdote. The narrator says that he had heard that when Shaykh Sharaf al-dīn Aḥmad was in the jungle of Rājgīr, a Jogī who had received news that a holy man was dwelling there wanted to meet him. The Jogī went into the jungle and reached the place where the Shaykh was living.

language of the Jogīs was what is called a mard-i kāmīl ('perfect man').

"If he tells the jungle to turn to gold," the Shaykh replied, "it turns to gold."

The jungle immediately turned to gold. The Shaykh made a sign to the jungle and said, "Stay as you were! I was only telling a story."

An anecdote, in the Javāmi<sup>c</sup>al-kilm of Saiyid Muḥammad Akbar Ḥusaynī, relates in great detail the refusal of the gifts, proffered by a Jogī, who claimed to be the Nāth Bālgundā'ī, by Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz. The compiler of this collection of Malfūzāt was the elder son of the Shaykh, and the anecdote was recorded from the Shaykh's own lips. An actual meeting must have taken place between the Shaykh and the Jogī and at some time in the previous twenty years at Dehlī. The conversation of the disciples of the Shaykh which is recorded at the close must have taken place on the day of the record, viz. 4 Ramaḍān 802/29 April 1400.

This is the most important and informative of all anecdotes of confrontation between Sūfīs and Jogīs. The subsequent remarks of the Shaykh provide a recognizable though unrecorded variant of a well known story of the cycle of legends of the nāthas, which enables us to conjecture the state of development of a branch of the nātha panthī tradition current in Dehlī in the fourteenth century. That the confrontation took place within the capital city itself may be inferred from the fact that the Jogī visited the Shaykh at his populous khānqāh. Although the location in the city of this later fourteenth century establishment is now uncertain, Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz was resident at Dehlī from his reception of khilāfat to the time of his migration to the Deccan in 801-2/1398-1400.

Apart from such light as it throws on the development of the Nātha tradition, the evidence of the anecdote has wider relevance to the conditions of North Indian religious life in enabling us to put forward a less facile explanation than those normally advanced for some of the anecdotes of anachronistic encounters found both in hagiographic traditions and in other sources. It also provides an extended summary of the type of magical gifts and powers popularly attributed to Jogīs. The Jogī offers to the Shaykh successively (i) the secret of alchemy, (ii) knowledge to preserve him from enemies, (iii) eye-black which bestows invisibility upon the wearer

intercourse, (v) to make the string-bed of the snaykh move by itself. In spite of its length and the indelicate character of some of the information, the contents of the anecdote are sufficiently important to demand a literal translation.

Mention had been made of alchemy. (Saiyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz) said, "It was the day of Istiftāh when a young Jogī of about thirty years of age came and sat down. On the day of Istiftāh there was of course a great crowd of people who had come to renew their allegiance and to meet (me). (The Jogī) said: "I have come from far away to visit you. I have something to say, which I will tell you if I can do so in private."

I told the servant, Mawlānā Khizr, to bring up those who had renewed their allegiance (bay<sup>c</sup>at) and had gone out to perform two rak<sup>c</sup>ats; but to keep back the other people. He brought them in and I said something to each of them, and excused myself from them. We were then in private.

"I have come from a distant land especially for you," he began. "For what purpose?" I asked. "Tell me!"

"My pīr has given me something," he said, "and he told me to give it to the man."

"Whom do you call the man?" I asked.

"He who does not lust after this," he said. "I searched, but I have found no man but you. I have come to fulfil his order. What (else) I have with me I will also give to you."

"Indeed," I said, "and may I know what it is?"

"Rasāyan," he said, -- which is to say kīmiyā (alchemy).

"It is not of the kind that I ask for something from you this moment and burn it and transmute it. I have something present here, which is in my begging bowl. I will take it out and place it in front of you."

In front of me there was lying every kind of small change, half ṭankas and ten jītal pieces and silver ṭankas and others besides these.

"This is my alchemy," I said. "I have no need of no other."

"I know of what use it will be to you," he said, "but if you give it to a faqīr who is in debt and has daughters, it will be of use to him."

"I will give to him to whom God causes something to be given," I said. "Otherwise I would give wheresoever I pleased, without His permission."

"To those to whom God causes to be given?" he repeated.

something upon them without my aid and will satisfy their needs. In these circumstances why should I undertake this superfluous act?"

"And yet why does this knowledge exist?" he said.

"You speak well," I said. "We believe that he who leaves the world poor and empty-handed, on the morrow of the Resurrection will have a high place and splendour and station with God. The hand of the man who possesses this knowledge will never be empty, and his heart will be abundantly set upon money, and he will not be a fagīr. His heart will become dark, and his interior corrupted and sullied, and thus he will never attain this end. I would rid myself of such wealth. I will enjoy nothing from this: what is the use of it?"

I did not tell him that I was a man who would accept nothing, but someone else did.

"I have something else," he then said. "Accept that."

"What is it?" I said.

"There will be a massacre in this city," he said, "and a mighty calamity will befall it. I will tell you something, and if you act accordingly the enemy will not find you to cause you injury."

"Will it avert (the calamity) after it has come," I said, "or before it has come?"

"Before it has come," he said.

"What has not happened has not happened," I said. "If on account of this thing I draw a calamity upon myself, what advantage will that be to me? I will die on the day that death comes, from a pain in the head or a pain in the belly. Then what use is this thing to me?"

"I have come and I am being put to shame," he said.

"Accept something from me!"

"I have eye-black," he added. "If you lay it upon your eyes you will become invisible. You have many followers. If you apply this surma to your eyes, they will not see you in their midst, and you will be able to hear all their tales and tell them about them; and they will become very attached to you, your affairs will go forward and your path be accepted."

"You speak truly," I said. "We call that type of person a bhāṇḍū, (thought-reader). But it is a rule among us that if I wish to be informed of anyone's story, I turn to my own heart. What my heart tells me I do, and it is as the heart says."



take something for holding back, they will enjoy it."

"My body has toiled at that for so many years, "I said, "and has done it cleanly and as a pious duty; it has such control over its member, that what it wishes it witholds and what it wishes it lets pass."

He kept talking: he started off again and I said nothing because he was a man who would not heed me. Again he said,

"You are alone at night, and you take your cot and carry it out from inside, and take it in from outside. Let it be just so much that your cot comes out by itself and sets itself in place; and goes back by itself inside."

"Is a crowd harmful or beneficial," I said, "to a solitary Darvesh and Sūfī?"

"Harmful," he said.

"Did you see the crowd at the door?" I said

"I saw them," he said, "There are many people sitting in front of your door."

"They have not seen my cot coming out and going in of itself," I said, "and yet in spite of this there is such a crowd. If they knew of such a thing it would be difficult for me to breathe. Then why should I do something, so that what is (already) harmful to me will be increased?"

He was broken-hearted and began to say, "Listen! I have come from far away, and I am going away put to shame. You have accepted nothing of mine."

"Why are you ashamed?" I said. "You have related well all that you can do. But why should I stretch forth my hand for what is not of use to me? What is the use of superfluities?"

I put into his hand some small change.

"I have no need of this," he said.

"I know," I said. "But it is a gift from me: accept it!"

He took it and tied it in a knot, after which I gave him a pomegranate. He took this for luck and said, "I am going to eat every bit of it."

He raised it to his head and eyes and grasped it firmly beneath his arm. He bent his forehead to the threshold, rubbed it upon the broken plaster there, wept loudly and said farewell. He went a little way, then came back and stopped. He came up to me and said,

"I am going away. I am going away put to shame. You have accepted nothing of mine. I have come from far away and I have come especially on your account."

he came back and said, "I am going to come once again to you."

"You may come," I said.

Again he went some way and then came back and said, "Do you remember my name?"

"Bārgundā'ī," he said. "If you hear my name from anyone you will know that it is me." After that he did not come back.

There was someone present who said, "Yes indeed, the name of Bārgundā'ī is known among the Jogīs. They hold him in great respect and he is exalted among them."

The Shaykh said, "Yes, that is in the land of Lakhnavatī. One day the King of Lakhnavatī seized him and cut off his head. Then suddenly he was seen wandering through the bazaar, clad in white. This time he was thrown into a well and it was filled up with stones until the ground was level. Again he was seen wandering in the bazaar in company with some Jogīs crying out loudly. He was seized again and a great stone was tied around his neck and he was drowned at the edge of the water of Lakhnavatī; but he was seen again in front of the portal of the king, seated in a posture of meditation with his two feet upon his thighs. He was taken off again (to the king), who gave him clothes and revered him: and he pardoned (the king)."

"He had a very long life," the Shaykh then said; "but the one who came to me was a young man of about thirty years of age." He added, "One or two others had come to the house in Old Dehlī (Dehlī-i kuhna) near the Badā'ōn Gate. One of them was a young man of dark complexion, naked from head to foot. In that state he came and sat down, and said, "Your friend <sup>C</sup>Abd al-Ghaffār had one thing," - meaning alchemy - "but he did not have the second," - meaning sīmiyā' (prognostication from the foreheads of men). He also tried very hard to make me accept one of these two things. I said that it was of no use to me and that I would never take it. If I related his conversation I would just be repeating what I have told about the other Jogī. He also kept turning back into the courtyard of the house, and each time he said, "Why are you turning me away from your door? The world is mad about me!"

"As God is my refuge," I said, "why should I take a thing

his forehead and went away.

Towards the close of this conversation, in his discussion of the significance of the Jogī's name, Gēsūdarāz has provided a version current in fourteenth century Dehlī of a legend in what we may describe as the nātha-siddha cycle. The tale, although very briefly and concisely related, is of interest as a very early dateable recording. Most extant Gorakhpantī narratives, whether in Sanskrit or North Indian vernaculars, are of suspect antiquity: while for portions of the nātha-siddha cycle of legends we are dependant on late nineteenth century recordings. Even the Tibetan chronicle of Tārānāth, which preserves the Vajrayāna Buddhist hagiographical tradition regarding many of the same figures, is two centuries later than this narrative of Gēsūdarāz.

The identification of the figure, 'exalted among the Jogīs', of the narrative of Gēsūdarāz presents more apparent than real difficulties. He is three times put to death, but rises again. He was first of all decapitated: secondly he was thrown into a well which was then blocked up: and thirdly he was thrown into the sea. All this was done to him at the orders of a King of Lakhnavatī, that is to say of Bengal. Decapitation recalls the quartering of Cauranga, Pūran Bhagat of the Panjāb, but this is an unsatisfactorily vague resemblance. Throwing into the sea recalls the legends of Mīna or Macchendra. But in a more specific and concrete way throwing into a well, which is then blocked up to ground level recalls the legends of Jālandharī: and the role played by a King of Lakhnavatī (i.e. Gopicand or Gopacand) make it certain that this is the nātha with whose legend we are dealing. It is of course a feature of legendary cycles, Indian and other, that anecdotes originally attached to heroes subsequently out of favour are subsumed into the saga of the current hero: this accounts for the inclusion of the first and third ordeals described. There seems to be no published modern Indian recording of a version of the nātha-siddha cycle in which the principal hero is Jālandharī, but although the cult of Jālandharī has probably decayed since medieval times, this deficiency may still reflect a failure to record surviving evidence. Even today the Paonāth sub-order of Jogīs, who have a religious establishment in Jaipur, describe themselves as followers of Jālandharī, while Bālaknāth, who should probably be identified with Jālandharī has followers in Bombay and in the Panjab. However in

of the nātha-siddha cycle are constructed in such a way as to assert the primacy of Gorakh, and the dependence in particular of Macchendra and Jālandharī upon Gorakh's aid to rescue them from predicaments into which they have fallen, largely as a result of their own deficiencies.

In Gēsūdarāz' narrative the Jogī is not called Jālandharī but - in Arabic script - BARKNDAY. The name is found as BALKNDAY in a passage of 'Umar Mihrābī's Hujjat al-Hind. K and G are not distinguished in the Perso-Arabic script of the period. The name is not well known among Jogīs today; it does not occur once in Briggs' study of them, nor among modern oral recordings of the nātha-siddha cycle. However, Bālgundāī is mentioned in the Janam-sākhīs or biographical accounts of Guru Nānak. The name also appears in collections of Hindī verses attributed to the siddhas together with the name Bālnāth, evidently for the same personage. This identification is confirmed by Sikh sources: a Janam-sākhī describes Nānak's visit to Tilla Bālgundāī, which cannot be other than Bālnāth Tilla to which medieval as well as modern references occur. The equation of Bālgundāī or Bālanātha with Jālandharī is completed by references of Tāranātha and other Tibetan sources:- "As regards former emanations, the ācārya (Jālandharī) had procured a boyish spirit. Therefore he was also called Bālapāda." (Pāda, pā is interchangeable with nātha: Jālandharī is called Jālandharī Pāda or Jālandharī Nātha). Thus the name of the Jogī of Gēsūdarāz' narrative satisfactorily matches the legend related.

In recorded modern Indian versions of the Jālandharī cycle Gorakh has to come and rescue Jālandharī from the well. The vast number of his, not Jālandharī's, disciples is emphasized.

tillon gorakh carhhiā, carhiā nād bājāe  
bāwan sai cele guptiā, bāwan sai cele nāl  
"Gorakh set out from Tilla, sounding his conch;  
"Fifty two hundred invisible and fifty two hundred  
(visible) disciples were with him."

Gorakh also nullifies the malignity of Jālandharī, providing lifeless images which will take the force of Jālandharī's curses as he emerges from the well. In fact all the recordings - with the exception of Grierson's Rangpur 'Tale of Manik Candra' whose centre of interest is not Jālandharī - contain contest anecdotes designed to demonstrate the superiority of Gorakh over Jālandharī: these are lacking in Gēsūdarāz' narration. This would suggest that, in North Western India at least, the Jogī cult of Bālgundāī/Jālandharī was not subordinated to that of Gorakh till . . .

of the legend preserved by Tārānāth. The burial of Jālandharī in the well and his rescue are related in a very similar form to current Indian versions; even the images made to take the force of Jālandharī's wrath are included. But the rescue is accomplished not by Gorakṣa but by Kṛṣṇācārī. Kṛṣṇācārī had previously held a discussion or disputation with Gorakṣa, and, although Tārānāth does not explain this, it is this disputation which has secured his right to rescue Jālandharī. In the Panjāb Kharī Bolī sāṅg (verse drama) recorded by Temple, the same disputation between Kanipā, Jālandharī's disciple, and Gorakh also occurs, but Kanipā himself, with his own and Jālandharī's numerous followers, is routed: "The fire caught them, their bodies burned and they ran about (crying), "Mercy!" The Vajrayāna affiliations of Kṛṣṇācārī/Kāṇhupā/Kanipā are particularly strong. We may therefore be confronted with a situation embodied in the differing versions of the legend in which Vajrayāna Yogīs and Gorakhpantīs have been involved in a contest to take over the cult of Jālandharī. In Tārānāth's relation Kṛṣṇācārī is found sitting with his host of followers in front of the palace of the King, in the manner of Jālandharī himself in Gēsūdarāz' relation.

Some additional evidence supports the supposition that the Jālandharī/Bālgundāī cult in North-western India was not subordinated to that of Gorakh until comparatively modern times. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the celebrated Jogī maṭh on the most easterly outcrop of the Salt Range, the Tilla or hill above Jhelum has usually been called Gorakh Tilla. The Jogīs are Gorakhpantī, the cult is of Gorakh (who is represented by a bearded image) and it is the most famous of holy places in the North-West associated with Gorakh. However the name Bālnāth Tilla is remembered; Briggs, for instance, remarks that 'the place was once known as Tilla Bālnāth'. Sir Alexander Cunningham conjectured that this was a trace of an ancient solar cult. From literary references there seems to be no doubt that Bālnāth or Bālgundāī was in possession of the sacred hill in the sixteenth century. An Indo-Afghan soldier, writing of a meeting with a sannyāsī which must have occurred in 1528 A.D., records that the sannyāsī said to him, "The emperor Bābur was helped by Bālnāth Jogī who dwells at Tilla, and I have come to help the Afghans." In his late sixteenth century description of India Abu'l-Faḍl refers to "the place of austerities (riyāzāt) of Bālnāth Jogī, which they call Tilla Bālnāth." According to the Miharbān janam-sākhī, dating

he held converse on the celestial mountain Sumeru, and later visited both Gorakh Haṭarī and Tilla Bālgundāī while in the vicinity of Saidpur. The mention of Gorakh Haṭarī suggests that this was then the main centre of Gorakhpanthī Jogī activity in the north-western Panjāb. Tilla in these sixteenth and seventeenth century sources is nowhere called Gorakh Tilla. The conclusion to be drawn is that at this important shrine the cult of Bālgundāī/Jālandharī had not yet been overshadowed and absorbed by that of Gorakh. This in turn confirms our interpretation of the narrative of Gēsūdarāz.

Two further points in this account of Gēsūdarāz deserve examination. The first concerns its character as an anecdote of our Class (4), "refusal of the proffered gift": the second concerns the instance that the meeting provides of an anachronistic encounter, in which the narrator rejects the claim of an impersonator. There is a most curious parallel to the story of the proffered gifts in Tārānāth's account of Jālandharī.

"At another time there lived in the western country of Maru an Ācārya named Jñānagupta. As he was once preaching a great sermon, there came in a wonderful Yogi at that time. In answer to the question who he was, he said that he was Jālandharī. After religious discourses, Jālandharī gave him a skull cap full of light. Ācārya Jñānagupta took it without consideration and at the same time extinguished the light..."

Shortly afterwards Tārānāth refers to Jālandharī's faculty of becoming invisible, which is found, among the powers offered by him to Gēsūdarāz. If we assume that the narrative of Gēsūdarāz about his meeting with the Jogī is based upon a real occurrence - and I myself in view of its extreme circumstantiality am inclined to assume this - is there a very distant oral transmission from his written record to Tārānāth's account? There do not seem to be records of other siddhas than Jalandharī proffering gifts to religious teachers who spurn them.

Gēsūdarāz' relation also affords an insight into a not always recognized class of anachronism in anecdotes of spiritual contest in Indian hagiographic traditions. When anachronistic encounters are described, modern rationalizing historians usually accept one of two explanations: either the anecdote is spurious, a mere pious invention, or the encounter described is historical, but either the saint or his hagiographer has been under a misapprehension regarding the person whom he met. The subsequent representative or incumbent at a shrine has been confused with his more illustrious

teenth century Arab traveller/records his own meeting with Shaykh Farīd al-dīn 'Ganj-i Shakar' at Ajodhan, but by his description of his eccentric personal habits we can identify the Shaykh whom he met as the great-grandson of Farīd, who was the sajjāda-nashīn at that time. We can see the process of identification of descendant and ancestor at work when a nineteenth century English author, himself perfectly aware of the difference, refers to the descendant of Sayyid Muḥammad Gēsūdarāz, whose narrative we are discussing here, as "the Geesoo darāz." Some medieval Indian hagiographers are aware of the possibility of such confusions. The compiler of the Miharbān janam-sākhī was more conscious of anachronisms than the compiler of the Purātan janam-sākhī: so Nānak, instead of meeting Bahā' al-dīn Zakariyā at Multan and Farīd at Pākpaṭṭan (Ajodhan), is made to meet their descendants at these places. But all anachronistic encounters with Ṣūfī Pīrs cannot be explained in this manner. Ibn Battūta also describes his meeting with Shaykh Jalāl al-dīn Tabrīzī, which took place around 1347 A.D. 'in the mountains of Kāmru'. Jalāl al-dīn Tabrīzī has travelled to Bengal and probably died there more than a century before. Attempts, not entirely unconvincing, have been made by modern historians to identify the Shaykh whom Ibn Battūta met with a Shaykh Jalāl al-dīn, or one of several of that name, who according to later accounts were active in Bengal and especially Sylhet (which may have been the place visited by Ibn Battūta) around the time of the Arab traveller's visit. But even if one of these identifications is correct, Ibn Battūta's account gives food for thought. He states that when, not long afterwards, the Shaykh died, his disciples believed him to be one hundred and fifty years of age. He also says that the Shaykh in conversation with him claimed to have witnessed events in Baghdad in the caliphate of al-Mustaḥṣim billāh, that is to say about a century earlier. It is possible that Ibn Battūta's memory may be at fault or that the traveller is here telling a tall tale: but the alternative should also be considered, that we are here confronted with an example of the charismatic impersonation of a Muslim pīr by someone who had inherited his role and claimed his authority.

Most Jogīs laid great stress on the quest for and attainment of physical immortality. The nāthas and siddhas do not die nor are they translated to a different spiritual existence: they are preserved forever in their mortal bodies, which, turned to adamant, are not subject to decay. It is not sur-

occur. What is more remarkable about the story told by Gēsūdarāz is the example which it provides of the sceptical rejection of such a claim. Bārgundāī had "lived for a long time", but the Jogī who called upon the Shaykh was "a young man of about thirty years of age". In fact Gēsūdarāz believed that it was not the true Bārgundāī. The prevalence of such charismatic impersonation among Jogīs and a violent rejection of their claims are found in the Hujjat al-Hind, a work cited earlier in this paper. I believe this to be nearly contemporary with the narrative of Gēsūdarāz, and its remarks present a striking parallel to this narrative. <sup>C</sup>Umar Mihrābī wrote:-

"These then are the Jogīs and they are more filthy (i.e. than the generality of Hindus): and regarding what they say, that they are Mācchindar Jogī and Bālgundāī Jogī and Ghorā Colī, this also is unworthy of belief. These had their day and it is years since they reached their end. They are not alive now but the accursed Jogīs keep their name fresh."

If my dating of this work to around 1400 a.D. is accepted, there can hardly be clearer testimony to the prevalence of charismatic impersonation among Jogīs in the later fourteenth century. In his old age Gēsūdarāz saw visions and conversed with angelic or supernatural personages: but with independent testimony regarding charismatic impersonation by Jogīs and the convincing circumstantiality of Gēsūdarāz's narrative (which even includes a passage of interest to numismatists), his meeting with the false Bārgundāī should be considered a historical and not an imaginary occurrence. Such events in hagiography as Gorakh's visit to Nanak's community at Kartārpur (as opposed to Nānak's visit to Gorakh upon Sumeru) cannot be dismissed as having no possible basis in historical reality: this could apply also to Kabīr's meeting with Gorakh, (if we are convinced that Kabīr himself has a historical existence).

#### Class (5): anecdotes referring to the lore of the Jogīs.

Some remarks quoted when considering the attitudes of Sūfīs towards Jogīs might also figure under this heading. Gēsūdarāz also reproduces another tale of the Nātha-siddha cycle, a version of morphological interest of the story of Macchendra's dalliance in the Kadālī forest and his rescue by Gorakh; and of the slaying of Gorakh of Macchendra's son born in the Kadālī forest, Binduk Nāth. This recital is given in the course of reflexions on the hindrance which devotion to wife and children presents to the seeker after God. Immediately before it the story of Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Isaac



(not unlike the foundation of a Purāṇi Śaī Kṛṣṇa) and the explanation that alchemy gave the necessary financial support probably reflect the more historically conscious mind of the Sūfī narrator.

There is a tale among the Hindūs that there were once two Jogīs, one the pīr and the other his murīd. For years they had travelled together until one day they agreed to wander around separately; and so they did. The one who was the pīr in his wanderings reached a wilderness. Now he was in search of the drug of imsāk, and suddenly he found it. To test it he drew near a woman, and found pleasure in the act. He also possessed the power of alchemy; and he settled down there, performed alchemy, bought some girls and was occupied in intercourse with them. He laid the foundations of a settlement there, and it grew to a great city of which the Jogī became the Rāy (Rāja). Now the disciple in his wanderings came to that city and he saw that where there had been but wilderness and jungle a settlement had somehow sprung up. He asked everyone and they said,

"There has been a settlement here for some time."

"Who is the Rāy of this place?" he asked.

"The Rāy of this place is such and such a man," they replied, "and he has such an appearance."

The (description of his) appearance aroused his suspicion and he guessed that he must be the other Jogī and that the drug of imsāk for which he had been searching had come into his hand ....

"I shall see him somehow," he thought, "but he is the Rāy of this place; how can a Jogī gain access to him?"

He arranged with the troop who sang and danced with the Rāy for them to bring him along with them, because he was a traveller and would like to see the spectacle.

"How can we take you?" they said.

"Put me among the torch-bearers and take me," he said.

They did this and brought him before the Rāy, and when he saw his face he recognized that it was the man. When the dance was ended he came forward and recited one sentence in the language of the Jogīs with the meaning, "Did you see a man anywhere who abandoned both worlds for one, and found what he sought and settled down to that?" The other realized that this man was his companion. He left everything and set out with him and returned to his old ways. One son who had been born to him he took with him.

"We would have no worry," his friend said, "if that boy was not with us. No attachment would fetter us."

The incident of the slaying of Binduk Nāth then occurred. Macchendra had three times told Gorakh to take the child out to relieve himself. On the last occasion, by a deliberate misunderstanding of Machendra's words, Gorakh killed the child. "You told me to split him: so I chopped him up." "You wanted this last link of mine to go," the other replied. "You have done well. Come, now that we have no worries, let us pursue our work and return to our former condition."

The story of the slaying of Binduk Nāth also appears in a variant form in the Bengali Goraksavijaya:- "To remove the illusion of Guru Mīnanāth and to recover him to his sense, Gorakhnath displayed various Yogic powers before the Guru.

and dried it in the sun, - and then revived him once more just by the fillip of his fingers..." (S.B. Dasgupta).

In Indian Sūfī literature a few realistic anecdotes of casual meetings of Fīrs and their disciples with Jogīs occur, in which no one enters into a contest or is overwhelmed by magical power. Two conversations recorded in the Favā'id al-Fu'ād illustrate the reputation which Jogīs enjoyed for their knowledge of medicine and minor magical arts. In the first Nizām al-dīn relates how a student at the Khānqāh of Farīd al-dīn at Ajodhan, after his hair had been shorn still possessed the worldly ambition of entering into trade. One day a Jogī came (to the Khānqāh) and the student, much to Nizām al-dīn's disgust, asked him for a medicine to make his hair grow long again. In another conversation Nizām al-dīn recalls an occasion when he had received an offer of marriage. A Jogī was talking in the presence of Farīd al-dīn and Nizām al-dīn and narrated the effects on a child of conception on each of the thirty days of the month. Nizām al-dīn memorized and repeated what the Jogī had said, but Farīd al-dīn remarked that these enquiries were not going to be of any practical use to him. The marriage did not in fact take place.

The spectacle of one of the best-loved and most influential of Indian Sūfīs memorizing a fragment of Yogic lore brings me to some concluding remarks about the limitations, indeed the opacity of the sources. It has been conjectured that Sūfīs in general and Indian Sūfīs in particular have been much influenced by Indian traditions of religious and mystical life, although this influence is scarcely visible in most Indian Sūfī literature. By the sixteenth century two literary works show the influence of Sūfī contacts with Nātha-panthī Jogīs. The first is a curious treatise, translation of a Sanskrit compendium of Yogic lore, found in Arabic and Persian recensions and called Haud al-hayāt or Bahr al-hayāt (see Yusuf Husain, "Haud al-hayāt: la version Arabe de l'Amratkund", in Journal Asiatique, CCXIII, 291-344). The account of a translation of this work immediately after the Muslim conquest of Bengal in the early thirteenth century may be rejected; but such a translation was clearly in existence before 1500 A.D. and enjoyed repute among notable Indian Sūfī Shaykhs. It was later disseminated in the Muslim Near East. Another work which contains Nātha-panthī Hindī verses used to illustrate Sūfī concepts and also shows the influence of Yogic physiological

ideas in its doctrinal content is the Rushd-nāma of <sup>c</sup>Abd al-Quddūs (c.1456-1537 A.D.). Such works suggest that Yogic influence on Indian Ṣūfī ideas and practice is more significant than we would guess from the hagiographical literature. This shares the defects of other varieties of Indo-Persian descriptive or historical writing, whose range is limited by conventions of thought, language and literary tradition which evolved and grew rigid outside India. One can only guess from stray references and small fragments of evidence in it the degree of adaptation to and integration with the Indian environment of the settled Muslim community. The conventional Persian descriptions often conceal a much Indianised situation.

---